

## God's Law Does Not Prohibit the Transfusion of Human Blood

Prior to July, 1945, the Watchtower Society of Jehovah's Witnesses taught that blood transfusions by its members was not prohibited. After 1945 blood transfusions were banned, and by 1961, any Jehovah's Witness who “accepted blood transfusion[s], and manifested an unrepentant attitude [was] disfellowshipped (excommunicated) ....” *Jehovah's Witnesses – Proclaimers of God's Kingdom*, [\_\_\_\_], 183-184. This prohibition, and severe punishment which ensued, also applied to a parent who prohibited their child's blood transfusion even if necessary to save his or her life ([jwfacts.com/watchtower/blood-transfusion.php](http://jwfacts.com/watchtower/blood-transfusion.php)).

This policy is still in effect although it has undergone radical transformation in scope. While “whole blood” transfusions are disallowed, today a Jehovah's Witness may transfuse, within certain prescribed guidelines, fractions, or components, of blood such as immune globulins, hemophiliac preparations and albumin. Typical of constantly changing Watchtower doctrine (in this case in the proper direction), one-hundred percent of blood fractions, or components, can be transfused by its members, but not all at once, not as “whole blood,” but in an extremely illogical piecemeal fashion - which violates the spirit of their own unscriptural precepts. The decision to accept a necessary transfusion of blood fractions (or permit a life-saving transfusion of fractions in the case of a child) is a matter for each individual's conscience.

The primary biblical verse used to defend the Watchtower Society's ban on intravenous blood transfusions is found at Acts 15:29 where the Council of Jerusalem decided that Gentile Christians (people of the nations) were to abstain from meat sacrificed to idols, from blood, from meats of strangled animals, and from unlawful marriage (fornication, Greek *pornea*) (*New American Bible, NAB*). Many, if not most, mainstream Christians view this “no-blood” and “no-meat” decree as a suggestion regarding dietary restrictions, not absolute law; it does not prohibit blood transfusions, and dealt with a limited, specific controversy that arose among mixed Jewish-Gentile Christian communities during the first century.

In time, the Acts 15 “Jewish” decree became a non-issue once the Jewish-Christian community in Jerusalem was scattered and/or destroyed by the Roman army in 70 A.D. Traditional mainstream Christians understand that the Acts 15 decree was derived from Mosaic law, and all such laws, not some of them but all of them, were nailed to the cross and done away with by virtue of Jesus Christ's atoning death. The Law “with its commandments and legal claims” was abolished (Ephesians 2:15). No man can redeem himself and attain eternal salvation by strict adherence to the Mosaic law. Accordingly, the blood decree was non-binding, the violation of which today does not prevent entrance into God's kingdom.

The central issue is whether the phrase “abstain from blood” prohibits blood transfusions, whether absolutely necessary to sustain life or not, particularly with respect to innocent children. This central issue, however, begs many questions; sub-issues which any first-year college student would be expected to raise. Does the Acts 15 decree unequivocally prohibit eating meat with blood under any circumstances? Was the ban on blood only applicable in situations where the life of an animal was taken? Must one abstain from all blood, including animal blood found in a rare T-bone steak? Does it prohibit sucking one's own cut finger? Must one abstain from human and animal blood? Is one permitted to remove and store one's own blood for future transfusion back into one's own body? Does it prohibit the introduction into your body coincidental blood associated with organ transplants? Does

abstention refer to “eating” blood only? Is transfusing blood the same as eating blood? Is the Mosaic prohibition limited to only eating flesh with blood?

Was the prohibition under the Mosaic law merely symbolic out of reverence for the sanctity of a sacrificed animal's life? Was the pouring out of blood a symbolic ritual, or was it to be taken literally in every circumstance? If transfusions are prohibited, what is the proper punishment for breach of this rule? If the transfusion of whole blood violates God's law, which it does not, how can transfusion of select portions, or fractions, of that blood not violate God's alleged law prohibiting transfusions? What is the Watchtower Society's rationale for permitting transfusion of blood fractions? Which specific Bible verses does the Society rely on to justify its highly questionable stance on the aforementioned issues, or are these restrictive rules arbitrary and capricious self-contradicting man-made rules that defy logic and Scripture? Will a blood transfusion cost a Christian the prospect of eternal life?

These questions can be answered only by examining the scriptural and historical context of the blood-abstention doctrine, the advances made in modern medicine, and the capricious inconsistencies in Watchtower blood prohibitions. Upon examining the evidence, a reasonable person of average intelligence must conclude that the Society's prohibition on blood transfusions violates Jehovah God's law which demands respect for the sanctity of human life. Denying blood transfusions violates the Almighty's commandment at Exodus 20:13, “Thou shall not kill.”

When these sub-issues are identified and analyzed it becomes apparent that the Society's reasoning is arbitrary, unscriptural, and superficial at best. Their false teachings, that abstaining from blood includes abstention from non-vital and vital blood transfusions which might save a life, is not taught in the Bible. It bears repeating; blood transfusions, while they may pose certain health risks like countless other medical procedures, do not violate God's law.

The Watchtower Society acknowledges that Mosaic law became non-binding and ineffectual as it pertains to Christians upon Christ's sacrificial death (Luke 16:16). Nevertheless, they teach that the prohibited conduct listed at Acts 15:29 carried forward the Mosaic law in principle with respect to abstaining from “meat sacrificed to idols, from blood, from eats of strangled animals, and from unlawful marriage,” or as others define such sexual prohibitions, fornication in its broader application. They have retained select portions of the Mosaic law and believe that an unrepentant Jehovah's Witness who receives, or permits others to receive, a transfusion of blood, [may] be subject to “eternal damnation.” *How Blood Can Save Your Life*, p. 31. They write that “[i]t may result in the immediate and very temporary prolongation of life, but at the cost of eternal life for a dedicated Christian,” (n. 77, p. 16, *Blood, Medicine, and the Law of God*, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1961, p. 54).

## **Respect for the Sanctity of Life**

The Watchtower Society's ban on blood transfusions necessary to save a life is a direct violation of God's laws evident in the Old and New Testament. Preeminent is Yahweh's command “Thou shall not kill” (Exodus 20:13), reiterated in the New Testament at Romans 13:9. God's view of the sanctity of human life, that it must be nourished, protected and cherished, is unmistakable. Under the Old Covenant, one who takes a life must forfeit his own (Genesis 9:6; Numbers 35:31, 33). The salvation of human life, in the present and the afterlife, is a fundamental theme that runs throughout Scripture (Psalm 34:7, 17, 10). Men beg for life (Psalm 119:25), and God preserves it (Psalm 36:6; 66:9; Jonah 2:6). God's concern for life, particularly that of human beings, is exemplified in the account of the great flood and the salvation of Noah and his family, and a great many animal species (Genesis 7:1-3).

The importance of the sanctity of human life was continually emphasized in the New Testament, even more so than in the Old Testament. Jesus taught that saving human life was paramount even if it violated Mosaic law; even if life was saved on the sabbath. Jesus asked those who condemned him, “Is it lawful on the sabbath to do a good deed or to do a bad deed, to save or to kill a soul?” (Mark 3:4-5; see also Luke 6:7-10). Saving a life was more important than obeying the letter of the Law. Refusing a blood transfusion when it might have saved a life, even if it violated a principle of Mosaic law, would have been specifically condemned by Christ, whom believers are commanded to obey at the risk of losing eternal life, for as it says at John 3:36, “Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, but whoever disobeys the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him.”

Jesus repeatedly drove this point home, that he wants “mercy, not sacrifice,” even if it violates Mosaic law (Matthew 12:7). God's high regard for the value and sanctity of actual human life, not merely symbolic life, is illustrated at Matthew 12:11: “Who will be the man among you that has one sheep and, if this falls into a pit on the sabbath, will not get a hold of it and lift it out? All considered, how much more worth is a man than a sheep?” Christ also illustrated the importance of saving life in King David's time, even if it violated the Law, when David and his hungry men “entered the house of God and ... ate the loaves of presentation, food it was not lawful for him to eat, nor for those with him, but for the priests only” (Matthew 12:1-4). The Mosaic law could, and should, be broken in order to save lives.

Of great significance is the Jewish interpretation of these same Mosaic blood restrictions which the Watchtower Society base their transfusion prohibition on – Jews allow blood transfusions regardless of these specific verses, most of which are compiled at Leviticus 17 and Deuteronomy 12:15-28. Furthermore, providing necessary life-sustaining medical treatment, like blood transfusions, even on the sabbath, is perfectly acceptable and humane under the Jewish principle “*pikuach nefesh*,” (jwfacts.com). Since the Watchtower Society bases its transfusion prohibition directly on Mosaic law, it is perplexing, and illogical, that they reject the Jewish interpretation and application of the Jews' own laws.

Denying oneself a blood transfusion which results in death is murder in God's eyes, plain and simple. Exerting pressure on someone to deny a third party (a child) a life-saving transfusion that results in death is likewise a culpable act. Denying yourself a necessary blood transfusion based on the Society's erroneous interpretation of Acts 15:29, and other Scripture, amounts to suicide, or self-murder. Why is it wrong and abhorrent to Almighty God? Because the Christian body is sacred, as the Apostle Paul wrote at 1 Corinthians 6:19, 20: “Do you not know that your body is a temple of the holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God, and that you are not your own? For you have been purchased at a price. Therefore glorify God in your body.” Psalm 63:4 elevates God's love over life, “for your love is better than life.” But only “here in the Old Testament is anything prized above life – in this case God's love,” (NAB, notes, 63,4).

Without qualification, Jesus made clear, it is not what enters a person's body that defiles a man, but what proceeds from him that defiles, and that includes the eating of blood (Matthew 15:11; see also Mark 7:15). Life is sacred. Christ highly valued the life of his disciples: “When you see the desolating abomination spoken of through Daniel standing in the holy place (let the reader understand), then those in Judea must flee to the mountains” (Matthew 24:15,16). “Give me life in accord with your word” (Psalm 119:25); “... in your justice give me life” (Psalm 119:40). God clearly believes the life of the true Christian to be precious, and the Acts 15 decree to “abstain from blood” must be interpreted in light of those verses which recognize the sanctity of life and the command to protect human life, not destroy it.

Murderers, on the other hand, including those who commit self-murder, and those who participate or encourage this deviant act (Proverbs 1:11; Romans 1:29-32) “shall not inherit God's kingdom” (Revelation 22:15; 1 Timothy 1:9; Galatians 5:21), but are likened to dogs, sorcerers, the unchaste, idol worshipers and “those who practice deceit.” The Watchtower Society has inverted God's law, turned it upside down. Murder, and self-murder, resulting from the Society's prohibition of blood transfusions, is a characteristic of the devil who “was a murderer from the beginning” (John 8:44). Wicked humans are filled with murder (Romans 1:29).

The simple fact is that the Jehovah's Witnesses of the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society are attempting to be justified, declared righteous and redeemed, thereby gaining entrance into the kingdom, by strict adherence to legalistic principles of the Mosaic law. Any serious student of that religion knows that their doctrines are to a great extent Old Testament-centric and based on works of many kind, regardless of the Society's denial. This includes denying oneself or others essential, and non-essential, blood transfusions which they mistakenly teach can prevent one's attaining eternal salvation.

But Paul taught the opposite at Galatians 5:4-5: “You are separated from Christ, you who are trying to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace. For through the Spirit by faith, we await the hope of righteousness.” Because the Watchtower Society and their Jehovah's Witnesses teach falsely that obtaining or allowing blood transfusions – a form of works that specifically violates God's law respecting the sanctity of life – they have fallen from grace and made Christ's sacrifice meaningless because they attempt to gain entrance to the kingdom by adhering to Mosaic law, which does not prohibit blood transfusions in the first place.

The Watchtower Society's heartless, sadistic and hypocritical practice of prohibiting blood transfusions for innocent children which results in their untimely and unnecessary deaths is a practice which can be attributed to Satan. Parallels can be drawn between Jehovah's Witness parents who sacrifice their children to their version of “Jehovah,” and Israelites of old who sacrificed their children to the pagan false god Molech in direct violation of God's warning not to at Leviticus 18:21: “You shall not offer any of your offspring to be immolated to Molech, thus profaning the name of your God.” But despite this warning they did. “They built high places to Baal in the Valley of Ben-hinnom, and immolated their sons and daughters to Molech, bringing sin upon Judah; this I never commanded them, nor did it even enter my mind that they should practice such abomination” (Jeremiah 32:35).

Parents who believe that denying their child a vital blood transfusion pleases the Watchtower's “Jehovah” are deluded, much as ancient Israelites who pleased Molech by throwing their children into the fire. It is an abhorrent, perverted thought that never entered the Almighty's mind. But it is not only the parents whose hands are stained with their children's innocent deaths, but every individual who adheres to, promotes, enforces or encourages the ban, including members of a hospital liaison committee, the Governing Body, all who draft prohibition literature, every member of the governing hierarchical order from the “slave” down to the elder and ministerial servant, and every single member of the Jehovah's Witnesses religion who preach, whether door-to-door or otherwise, that God's law prohibits blood transfusions, are guilty of this unbiblical, heinous act. One who incites, or assists, another to commit murder, is as guilty as the one who commits the crime of murder and shall be punished as Jehovah sees fit.

The Watchtower Society of Jehovah's Witnesses relies to its pending detriment on one particular verse of Scripture which they believe permits them to escape their blood-sins unscathed. As they so often do, they pluck verse out of context. Romans 6:7 provides that “a dead person has been absolved (acquitted) from sin.” As such, the Jehovah's Witnesses believe that they have nothing to fear once they die, that

they won't be punished for this. They write:

Both those who formerly did good things and those who formerly practiced bad things will be “judged individually according to their deeds.” What deeds? **If we were to take the view that people were going to be condemned on the basis of deeds in their past life, that would be inconsistent with Romans 6:7: “He who has died has been acquitted from his sin.”** It would also be unreasonable to resurrect people simply for them to be destroyed. So, at John 5:28, 29a, Jesus was pointing ahead to the resurrection; then, in the remainder of verse 29, he was expressing the outcome after they had been uplifted to human perfection and been put on judgment. (*Reasoning*, 337)

But surrounding verses 1-11 make it perfectly clear that Paul was referring to those who died with Christ to baptism, and are raised in spirit to live for God. True believers are passed over in the condemnation, while all others are judged for deeds committed “in this body,” in this life (2 Corinthians 5:6-10 ). This is verified at Romans 6:23: “For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.” Man's physical death does not acquit man of sins, including sins associated with the unlawful denial of blood transfusions; only the atoning death of Jesus Christ acquits men of their sins (Romans 5:16).

The practical consequence of the Watchtower's false teaching is that the Jehovah's Witnesses are under the mistaken belief that they will not have to stand before the judgment seat and be judged for their sins committed in this life. But nothing could be further from the truth. False Christians will suffer the penalty for their egregious transgressions, such as those related to the Watchtower's unbiblical and unjustifiable ban on blood transfusions using contorted Jonestown logic that has slaughtered so many needlessly. Whether premised on Noahide law, Mosaic law, or the Acts 15 decree, it was not the use of blood per se that was prohibited, but the misuse of blood. And today with advances in modern medicine, it is the failure to use blood where necessary to uphold God's law respecting the sanctity of life that is condemned in the Bible.

The Watchtower Society invokes Jesus' words at Matthew 16:25 in defense of their promotion of self-murder: “For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake will find it.” But preceding verse 24 places Christ's words in proper context. “Whoever wishes to come after me must deny himself, take up his cross and follow me.” One must be alive to follow Christ. Jesus is not speaking of suicide, that one must kill oneself to please him, and the Watchtower's Jonestown reasoning, which is laying the foundation for mass suicide, has no place within the true Christian community of God's people. Interpreting 16:25 as a suicide pact contradicts the entire Bible which recognizes the sanctity of human life, and the command to preserve it when appropriate. Christ was referring to courage under persecution and self-denial, while alive, in this life. “[T]o deny someone is to disown him (see 10, 33; 26,34-35) and to deny oneself is to disown oneself as the center of one's existence” (*NAB* notes 16, 24). It is obvious that Jesus was not advocating self-murder because verse 24 refers to his potential disciples coming after Jesus and following him, in the present, which a disciple cannot do if dead as a result of self-murder through the refusal of a necessary blood transfusion.

## The Acts 15 Decree

The Watchtower's argument in support of its ban on blood transfusion is simple. All men, particularly Christians, are to abstain from all blood due to four specific prohibitions found at Acts 15:29. Christians are to abstain from 1) meat sacrificed to idols, 2) from blood, 3) from meats of strangled

animals, and 4) from fornication. They argue that these four rules based on the Mosaic law continued forward and survived, yet they concede that the Law with its legalistic decrees was nailed to the cross and done away with upon the death of Christ. The Acts 15 decree, they believe, is an exception.

The four commands in the Acts 15 decree are equal, they say; equated simply because they are listed together. And because fornication is prohibited and violates God's law, the consumption of blood must also automatically be prohibited as well, in addition to consumption of meats sacrificed to idols and things strangled (animals which die on their own and are not slaughtered and bled) (*Reasoning* at 71). A blood transfusion is the same as eating blood, which they contend is absolutely forbidden. All blood must be poured out onto the ground or disposed of because that is the only use of blood recognized by God. Consequently, they preach, blood cannot be stored, including the blood of a person who would otherwise transfuse their own blood back into themselves in the course of a medical procedure.

But the Watchtower Society's position is indefensible, logically and scripturally flawed in the extreme on every level. With respect to the four "prohibitions" being equal, they are not, and in the New Testament were treated as independent of each other with respect to the severity of the infraction and punishment. Regarding Acts 15:28, 29, the Society writes: "There the eating of blood is equated with idolatry and fornication, things that we should not want to engage in" (*Reasoning* at 71).

While fornication violates God's law, eating meat sacrificed to idols did not, and was not prohibited in the New Testament. Paul made this abundantly clear in numerous verses. "Eat anything sold in the market," he wrote at 1 Corinthians 10:25. Regarding what one eats, "nothing is unclean in itself" (Romans 14:15). "For the kingdom of God is not a matter of food and drink, but of righteousness, peace, and joy in the holy Spirit" (Romans 14:17). Speaking of meat sacrificed to idols he wrote that "everything is indeed clean (verse 20). Food will not bring us closer to God. We are no worse off if we do not eat, nor are we better if we do" (1 Corinthians 8:8).

It wasn't the eating of meat sacrificed to idols per se that was dissuaded, but the damaging effect it had on a brother who was offended by it. "If food (sacrificed to idols) causes my brother to sin," wrote Paul, "I will never eat meat again" (1 Corinthians 8:13). The concern was not idolatry as the Watchtower erroneously claims, but it addressed mixed communities where Gentile Christians might offend their Jewish Christian brothers by eating such meats thereby creating a stumbling block.

Eating such meats was not forbidden, did not violate God's law, and was not punished; rather, it was a suggestion, a request. Like then, today Christians are permitted to consume meat for sale in a market without losing the prospect of eternal salvation, and without regard to whether someone else might have dedicated it to an idol. Fornication, on the other hand, violates God's law and may be punished. Fornication and eating meats sacrificed to idols are not equal and are rightly severable; they are not treated the same. Just because fornication is forbidden doesn't mean that eating meat sacrificed to idols is, according to Paul.

The Watchtower's statement that "eating of blood is equated with idolatry and fornication" left out the fourth prong of the Acts 15 decree, the abstention from "things strangled" (*Reasoning* at 71). They failed to mention it for good reason because they do not want to draw attention to this prohibition specifically addressed in the Mosaic law at Leviticus 17:15 and 11:39,40 which completely and unequivocally proves wrong their ban on blood transfusions. Leviticus 17:15 provides, "Everyone, whether a native or an alien, who eats of an animal that died of itself or was killed by a wild beast shall wash his garments, bathe in water, and be unclean until evening, and then he will be clean. If he does not wash or does not bathe his body, he shall have the guilt to bear."

According to this section of the Mosaic law, eating blood was clearly permissible; a person was not cut off, not disfellowshipped, and most certainly did not lose the prospect of eternal salvation. As such, blood could be eaten, and the consequence was limited to being declared unclean, and then only if he failed to wash his garments and bathe in water. Therefore, the Watchtower Society's statement that "only sacrificial use of blood has ever been approved by God" (*Reasoning* at 71) is false. Their claim that the only allowed use for blood is that it be poured out and never transfused or stored, is likewise an unbiblical false statement. The Society's draconian punishment for transfusing, or eating, blood (disfellowshipping and loss of eternal life) and the so-called reward for refusing a necessary transfusion (death by suicide) are completely out of line with established Bible principles.

Avoiding "all things strangled" is therefore a suggestion, not an absolute prohibition, the violation of which does not merit punishment like that associated with fornication. Blood can be consumed without suffering the penalties and consequences established by the Watchtower Society.

The Society attempts to shore up their doctrine with Noahide law, commands given to Noah and his family after the flood which the Jehovah's Witnesses preach are laws binding on all humans, not merely the Jews. But was Genesis 9:3,4 intended to prohibit all men from eating (transfusing) blood under any circumstance? Not according to Deuteronomy 14:21. The Noahide law at Genesis 9:3,4 provides: "Every creature that is alive shall be yours to eat; I give them all to you as I did the green plants. Only flesh with its lifeblood still in it you shall not eat" (*NAB*).

The Watchtower Society incorrectly interprets this verse to mandate that "[a]ny animal used for food should be properly bled. One that is strangled or that dies in a trap or that is found after it has died is not suitable for food" (*Ibid* at 71). But this claim is also a baseless false statement aimed at justifying the ban on transfusions because Deuteronomy 14:21 specifically allowed men, non-Israeites, to eat such meat and the undrained blood: "You must not eat any animal that has died of itself, for you are a people sacred to the Lord, your God. But you may give it to an alien who belongs to your community, and he may eat it, or you may sell it to a foreigner." Verse 21, like Leviticus 17:15, completely unravels and proves wrong the Society's scriptural basis for banning the consumption, through transfusion or eating, of blood. Pouring out blood as a symbolic gesture of respect for the sanctity of life was not the only permitted use of blood. Eating blood by Gentiles (aliens and foreigners) did not, and does not, violate God's law, particularly Noahide law; and it most certainly was not punished by death, excommunication or disfellowshipping, or the loss of the prospect of eternal salvation.

Furthermore, the law given to Noah at Genesis 9:3,4 pertained only to the eating of animal flesh with blood; it did not address the intravenous transfusion of human blood, let alone the oral consumption of human blood along with the eating of human flesh. Genesis 9:3,4 is inapplicable; it has no bearing on modern-day blood transfusions necessary to save a human life.

Given the above, what does "abstain from blood" in the Acts 15 decree refer to? It refers to the blood of animals that are slaughtered and eaten, or sacrificed as atonement on the altar, as explained in numerous passages of the Mosaic law, particularly those contained in the Book of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Illustrative is Leviticus 17:8-14 and Deuteronomy 12:15-17, 20-25.

8 "Also you shall say to them: 'Whatever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers who dwell among you, who offers a burnt offering or sacrifice, 9 and does not bring it to the door of the tabernacle of meeting, to offer it to the LORD, that man shall be cut off from among his people.

10 ‘And whatever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers who dwell among you, who eats any blood, I will set My face against that person who eats blood, and will cut him off from among his people. 11 For the life of the flesh *is* in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it *is* the blood *that* makes atonement for the soul.’ 12 Therefore I said to the children of Israel, ‘No one among you shall eat blood, nor shall any stranger who dwells among you eat blood.’ (Leviticus 17:8-14)

15 “However, you may slaughter and eat meat within all your gates, whatever your heart desires, according to the blessing of the LORD your God which He has given you; the unclean and the clean may eat of it, of the gazelle and the deer alike. 16 Only you shall not eat the blood; you shall pour it on the earth like water. 17 You may not eat within your gates the tithe of your grain or your new wine or your oil, of the firstborn of your herd or your flock, of any of your offerings which you vow, of your freewill offerings, or of the heave offering of your hand. (Deuteronomy 12:15-17)

20 “When the LORD your God enlarges your border as He has promised you, and you say, ‘Let me eat meat,’ because you long to eat meat, you may eat as much meat as your heart desires. 21 If the place where the LORD your God chooses to put His name is too far from you, then you may slaughter from your herd and from your flock which the LORD has given you, just as I have commanded you, and you may eat within your gates as much as your heart desires. 22 Just as the gazelle and the deer are eaten, so you may eat them; the unclean and the clean alike may eat them. 23 Only be sure that you do not eat the blood, for the blood *is* the life; you may not eat the life with the meat. 24 You shall not eat it; you shall pour it on the earth like water. 25 You shall not eat it, that it may go well with you and your children after you, when you do *what is* right in the sight of the LORD. (Deuteronomy 12:20-25)

Through a simple process of logical deduction it becomes obvious to a reasonable person of average intelligence – or less than average, for that matter – that the Acts 15 decree does not prohibit blood transfusions because the prohibition pertained to the respect for sanctity of the life of slaughtered animals. It was not about the consumption of blood per se because, as shown above, it was permitted under Leviticus 17:15 and Deuteronomy 14:21. Blood was eaten by Israelites and non-Israelites without punishment or retribution. And since blood could be eaten, it wasn't the ingestion of that liquid organ that violated God's law in and of itself, but the eating of it in conjunction with the killing of an animal; the crime in that context was therefore symbolic. If man did not slaughter the animal for food, or as a holocaust or sacrifice, that meat, whether it died on its own or was “strangled” could, and was, eaten “with the blood.”

As such, the blood laws at Leviticus and Deuteronomy have absolutely no bearing with respect to modern-day transfusions because no animal is killed in order to acquire the blood. Blood donors are not killed, and they are not animals to be eaten. Therefore no such respect for the life of a dead animal need be shown; there is no blood from a slaughtered animal that must be poured onto the ground and covered up. Accordingly, there is no such surviving “principle” in Mosaic law that leads to the prohibition of blood transfusions that continued into the Christian era as the Watchtower mistakenly teaches. Their “principle” which mandates self-murder, or suicide, and the murder of innocent third parties, is a complete fabrication; man-made laws that go far beyond the written word found in the Bible and God's immutable laws commanding the respect for human life. But even if, for the sake of argument, the Acts 15 decree regarding the consumption of meat and blood based on the Mosaic law



actually prohibited blood transfusions, those laws were nailed to the cross and done away with at Christ's death (Luke 16:16; Galatians 5:4-5).

The Jehovah's Witnesses' attempt to equate blood transfusions with eating blood is likewise doomed to failure. As chronicled in medical documents worldwide, blood is not a nutrient like food. No qualified physician prescribes blood to cure a patient's hunger. Comparing blood to alcohol doesn't help the Watchtower's case either. They reason: “[C]onsider a man who is told by the doctor that he must abstain from alcohol. Would he be obedient if he quit drinking alcohol but had it put directly into his veins?” (*Reasoning* at 73). This argument, however, is weak at best because God does not prohibit blood transfusions, whether necessary or not, and blood is not transfused in order to get drunk and have a good time, but to save life. Furthermore, as Paul Grundy at [jwfacts.com](http://jwfacts.com) writes, “Blood is not a nutrient. Blood transfusions do not nourish the body and this is not the reason a patient is given a transfusion. Blood is used as a volume expander and to carry oxygen .... A blood transfusion is actually a cellular organ transplant, and organ transplants are permitted by the Watchtower Society.”

With respect to alcohol not being the same as blood, he continues, “[W]hen blood is introduced directly into the veins as a transfusion it circulates and functions as blood. Similarly, when a person orally ingests alcohol it is absorbed as alcohol into the blood stream. Alcohol is not broken down by the stomach and for this reason it is the same as injecting it directly. On the other hand, orally eaten blood when digested does not enter the circulation as blood, but is broken down into simple components” ([jwfacts.com/watchtower/blood-transfusion.php](http://jwfacts.com/watchtower/blood-transfusion.php)).

To reiterate what was said earlier with respect to fornication being equated with things strangled, meats sacrificed to idols and the consumption of blood, it is apparent that the four items of the Acts 15 decree are therefore not equal in terms of their importance and punishment. They are not joined together and do not survive into the twenty-first century simply because the prohibition against fornication is valid today. And they most certainly aren't equal because they are listed in the same sentence, which is one of the weakest arguments the Watchtower Society has ever made.

If that were the case, gossips will suffer the same penalties as murderers simply because Paul included both in the same verse at Romans 1:29. But YHWH, Almighty God, is a “God of justice” (Isaiah 30:18). And a just God will reward and punish according to one's deeds. It is a sliding-scale of justice; the gossip is not to be punished to the same degree as Adolf Hitler. Some will receive a prophet's reward, some a righteous man's reward, and others a reward for giving a cup of water to a disciple because he is a disciple (Matthew 10:40-42). Some will be beaten with fewer strokes than others (Luke 12:47, 48) and teachers are to be held to a higher standard (James 3:1). And, the sin of fornication is not equal to accepting or permitting life-saving transfusions – which do not violate God's law.

The Watchtower Society is fully aware of the critical flaws in their doctrine and is currently in the process of overturning it as it did with their illogical and unscriptural earlier ban on vaccines and organ transplants. Allowing the transfusion of one-hundred percent of blood fractions brings them within two steps of abiding by God's law, though any reasonable, objective person recognizes the hypocrisy and farce which is being foisted on its members. The trend toward allowing whole-blood transfusions without threat of recrimination is motivated in large part by the looming specter of legal liability premised on theories such as the tort of misrepresentation. That is why one sees a shift; the Society's unequivocal ban is being replaced by shifting the burden to its members, allowing its people to accept blood fractions based on their conscience, even if it still might violate God's law.

But that is not good enough because some will still refrain from transfusions believing it continues to

violate the laws of God, which it does not. It is time for the Watchtower Society to cease and desist from its appalling charade banning blood transfusions and declare emphatically that whether necessary or not, blood transfusions do not violate God's law of love which demands respect for the sanctity and preservation of life. It is time for the Jehovah's Witnesses to stop murdering themselves and their innocent children based on an unsubstantiated and hypocritical doctrine; hypocritical because the Jehovah's Witnesses do not go to war out of the command to love one's enemies, but they readily sacrifice their own brothers and sisters, who are to be loved fiercely, on the bloodless altar of Molech.

“Too costly in the eyes of the Lord is the death of his faithful” (Psalm 116:15). “[T]he meaning is that the death of God's faithful is grievous to God” (*NAB* notes, 116, 15). Denying oneself a necessary transfusion is the sin of self-murder, suicide. Denying your child who requires a necessary transfusion and which results in the child's death is the sin of murder; and all who participate to any degree in this deviant act are culpable. As for the Governing Body, and those who write these horrible laws, Jesus warned: “Whoever causes one of these little ones who believe [in me] to sin, it would be better for him if a great millstone were put around his neck and he were thrown into the sea” (Mark 10:42).